

NFL-H_∞/SMC 의 안정도 증명 : Part 4

이 상 성^o 박종근

서울대학교 전기공학부

이 주 장

한국과학기술원 전기공학과

Stability Proof of NFL-H_∞/SMC : Part 4

Sang-Seung Lee^o and Jong-Keun Park

School of Electrical Engineering
Seoul National University

Ju-Jang Lee

Dept. of Electrical Engineering
KAIST

[Abstract] In this paper, a stability proof of the closed-loop stability for the nonlinear feedback linearization-H_∞/sliding mode controller (NFL-H_∞/SMC) is done by a Lyapunov function candidate using an addition form of the sliding surface vector and the estimation error.

Keywords : nonlinear feedback linearization-H_∞/sliding mode controller, separation principle, Lyapunov function, separation principle, stability proof

1. Introduction

The standard Dole, Glover, Khargoneker, and Francis (abbr. : DGKF 1989) H_∞ controller (H_∞C) [1] has been extended to the nonlinear feedback linearization-H_∞/sliding mode controller (NFL-H_∞/SMC) [2-18]. In this paper, the closed-loop stability is proved by a Lyapunov function candidate using an addition form of the sliding surface vector and the estimation error.

2. NFL-H_∞/SMC

The state equations under worst case based on nonlinear feedback linearization (NFL) [19] are

$$z(t) = T(x(t)) \quad (1)$$

$$\dot{z}(t) = Az(t) + B_1 w_{\text{worst}}(t) + B_2 u(t) \quad (2)$$

$$p(t) = C_1 z(t) + D_{11} w_{\text{worst}}(t) + D_{12} u(t) \quad (3)$$

$$y(t) = C_2 z(t) + D_{21} w_{\text{worst}}(t) + D_{22} u(t) \quad (4)$$

The H_∞ estimator state equation based on NFL is [1]

$$\dot{\hat{z}}(t) = A\hat{z}(t) + B_2 u(t) + B_1 \hat{w}_{\text{worst}}(t) + Z_c K_c (y(t) - \hat{y}(t)) \quad (5)$$

$$\text{where } \hat{w}_{\text{worst}}(t) = \gamma^{-2} B_1^T X_c \hat{z}(t) \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{y}(t) = [C_2 + \gamma^{-2} D_{21} B_1^T X_c] \hat{z}(t) \quad (7)$$

The controller gain K_c is given by

$$K_c = \tilde{D}_{12} (B_2^T X_c + D_{12}^T C_1) \quad (8)$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{D}_{12} = (D_{12}^T D_{12})^{-1} \quad (9)$$

The estimator gain K_c is given by

$$K_c = (Y_c C_1^T + B_1 D_{21}^T) \tilde{D}_{21} \quad (10)$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{D}_{21} = (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} \quad (11)$$

The term Z_c is given by

$$Z_c = (I - \gamma^{-2} Y_c X_c)^{-1} \quad (12)$$

The controller Riccati equation term X_c is

$$X_c = \text{Ric} \begin{bmatrix} A - B_1 \tilde{D}_{12} D_{12}^T C_1 & \gamma^{-2} B_1 B_1^T - B_1 \tilde{D}_{12} B_1^T \\ -\tilde{C}_1^T \tilde{C}_1 & -(A - B_1 \tilde{D}_{12} D_{12}^T C_1)^T \end{bmatrix} \quad (13)$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{C}_1 = (I - D_{12} \tilde{D}_{12} D_{12}^T) C_1 \quad (14)$$

The estimator Riccati equation term is

$$Y_c = \text{Ric} \begin{bmatrix} (A - B_1 \tilde{D}_{12} D_{12}^T C_1)^T & \gamma^{-2} C_1 C_1^T - C_1^T \tilde{D}_{21} C_1 \\ -\tilde{B}_1 \tilde{B}_1^T & -(A - B_1 \tilde{D}_{12} D_{12}^T C_1) \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{B}_1 = B_1 (I - D_{21} \tilde{D}_{21} D_{21}^T) \quad (16)$$

The estimated control input based on NFL is

$$u_c(t) = -K_c \hat{z}(t) \quad (17)$$

The closed loop system can be expressed as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{z}(t) \\ \dot{\hat{z}}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & -B_2 K_c \\ Z_c K_c C_1 & A_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z(t) \\ \hat{z}(t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ Z_c K_c D_{21} \end{bmatrix} w_{\text{worst}}(t) \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} p(t) \\ y(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & -D_{12} K_c \\ C_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z(t) \\ \hat{z}(t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ D_{21} \end{bmatrix} w_{\text{worst}}(t) \quad (21)$$

$$\text{where } A_1 = A - B_2 K_c + \gamma^{-2} B_1 B_1^T X_c - Z_c K_c (C_1 + \gamma^{-2} D_{21} B_1^T X_c) \quad (22)$$

The state equation based on NFL is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}(t) &= Az(t) + B_1 w_{\text{worst}}(t) + B_2 u(t) \\ &= (A + B_1(\gamma^{-2} B_1^T X_w))z(t) + B_2 u(t) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The estimation error equation is

$$e(t) = z(t) - \hat{z}(t) \quad (28)$$

The differential estimation error equation is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e}(t) &= \dot{z}(t) - \dot{\hat{z}}(t) \\ &= -(A - \gamma^{-2} B_1 B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-2} D_{21} B_1^T X_w))e(t) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Or, from equation (2), (17) and (23), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}(t) &= Az(t) + B_1 w_{\text{worst}}(t) + B_2 u(t) \\ &= (A - B_2 K_c)z(t) - B_2 K_c e(t) + B_1 w_{\text{worst}}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The complete closed loop dynamics is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{z}(t) \\ \dot{e}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A - B_2 K_c & -B_2 K_c \\ 0 & A_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z(t) \\ e(t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} w_{\text{worst}}(t) \quad (32)$$

where

$$A_3 := -(A - \gamma^{-2} B_1 B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-2} D_{21} B_1^T X_w)) \quad (33)$$

Theorem 1: Consider the state equations (2-4) based on NFL for the regulation problem under a worst case and the H_∞ estimator (5) based on NFL. The equal controller gain K_{W-SMC}^{equal} and estimator gain $Z_w K_e$ under a worst case may be selected separately for desired closed-loop behavior.

Proof. To show the separation property of the closed-loop system, the estimation error equation and differential estimation error equation

$$\begin{aligned} e &= z - \hat{z} \\ \dot{e} &= \dot{z} - \dot{\hat{z}} = Az + B_1 w_{\text{worst}} + B_2 \hat{u}_{H_\infty/SMC}^{\text{equal}} \\ &\quad - [A\hat{z} + B_1 \hat{u}_{H_\infty/SMC}^{\text{equal}} + B_1 \hat{w}_{\text{worst}} + Z_w K_e (y - \hat{y})] \\ &= Az + B_1 w_{\text{worst}} - A\hat{z} - B_1 \hat{w}_{\text{worst}} - Z_w K_e y + Z_w K_e \hat{y} \\ &= -(A - \gamma^{-2} B_1 B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-2} D_{21} B_1^T X_w))e \\ \dot{z} &= Az + B_1 w_{\text{worst}} + B_2 \hat{u}_{H_\infty/SMC}^{\text{equal}} = Az + B_1 w_{\text{worst}} - B_2 K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} \hat{z}(e + z) \\ &= (A - B_2 K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}})z - B_2 K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} e + B_1 w_{\text{worst}} \end{aligned}$$

The complete closed loop dynamics is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{z} \\ \dot{e} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A - B_2 K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} & -B_2 K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} \\ 0 & A_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ e \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} w_{\text{worst}}$$

where $A_3 := -(A - \gamma^{-2} B_1 B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-2} D_{21} B_1^T X_w))$

The characteristic values is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(s) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} sI - A + B_2 K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} & -B_2 K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} \\ 0 & sI - A_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= |sI - (A - B_2 K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}})| \cdot |sI - A_3| \end{aligned}$$

The separation principle is satisfied. This completes the proof of this theorem. \square

The state equation based on NFL under a worst case is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}(t) &= Az(t) + B_1 w_{\text{worst}}(t) + B_2 u(t) \\ &= (A + B_1(\gamma^{-2} B_1^T X_w))z(t) + B_2 u(t) \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The Lyapunov's function candidate is chosen by

$$V(z(t)) = \sigma^T(z(t)) / 2 \quad (37)$$

The time derivative of $V(z(t))$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(z(t)) &= \sigma(z(t))\dot{\sigma}(z(t)) \\ &= G_{SS}^T z(t) G_{SS}^T \dot{z}(t) \\ &= G_{SS}^T z(t) G_{SS}^T [(A + B_1(\gamma^{-2} B_1^T X_w))z(t) + B_2 u_{H_\infty/SMC}^{\text{equal}}(t)] \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The control inputs with switching function are

$$\begin{aligned} u_{H_\infty/SMC}^+(t) &\geq -(G_{SS}^T B_2)^{-1} [G_{SS}^T (A + B_1(\gamma^{-2} B_1^T X_w))]z(t) \\ &\text{for } G_{SS}^T z(t) > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

$$\begin{aligned} u_{H_\infty/SMC}^-(t) &\leq -(G_{SS}^T B_2)^{-1} [G_{SS}^T (A + B_1(\gamma^{-2} B_1^T X_w))]z(t) \\ &\text{for } G_{SS}^T z(t) < 0 \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The control input with sign function is

$$u_{H_\infty/SMC}^{\text{sign}}(t) = -(G_{SS}^T B_2)^{-1} [G_{SS}^T (A + B_1(\gamma^{-2} B_1^T X_w))]z(t) \text{sign}(\sigma(z(t))) \quad (41)$$

The equation (41) can be simplified as follows:

$$u_{H_\infty/SMC}^{\text{sign}}(t) = -K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} z(t) \text{sign}(\sigma(z(t))) \quad (42)$$

$$K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} := (G_{SS}^T B_2)^{-1} [G_{SS}^T (A + B_1(\gamma^{-2} B_1^T X_w))] \quad (43)$$

Finally, the estimated control input vector is

$$\hat{u}_{H_\infty/SMC}^{\text{sign}}(t) = -K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} \hat{z}(t) \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z}(t))) \quad (44)$$

subject to, $\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z}(t))) = 1$ for $\sigma(\hat{z}(t)) > 0$

$$\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z}(t))) = 0 \text{ for } \sigma(\hat{z}(t)) = 0$$

$$\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z}(t))) = -1 \text{ for } \sigma(\hat{z}(t)) < 0$$

Theorem 2: Consider the state equations based on NFL for the regulation problem under a worst case (2-4) and the H_∞ estimator based on NFL (5). The estimated SMC law with sign function based on NFL is guaranteed an asymptotically stable for the system (2)

$$\hat{u}_{H_\infty/SMC}^{\text{sign}} = -K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} \hat{z} \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z}))$$

$$K_{W-SMC}^{\text{equal}} := (G_{SS}^T B_2)^{-1} [G_{SS}^T (A + B_1(\gamma^{-2} B_1^T X_w))]$$

subject to, $\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z}(t))) = 1$ for $\sigma(\hat{z}(t)) > 0$

$$\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z}(t))) = 0 \text{ for } \sigma(\hat{z}(t)) = 0$$

$$\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z}(t))) = -1 \text{ for } \sigma(\hat{z}(t)) < 0$$

Proof. Let us define the estimation error

$$e = z - \hat{z}$$

$$\dot{e} = \dot{z} - \dot{\hat{z}} = Az + B_1 w_{\text{worst}} + B_2 \hat{u}_{H_w/SMC}^{*SN}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & - \left[A\hat{z} + B_2 \hat{u}_{H_w/SMC}^{*SN} + B_1 \hat{w}_{\text{worst}} + Z_w K_e (y - \hat{y}) \right] \\ & = Az + B_1 w_{\text{worst}} - A\hat{z} - B_1 \hat{w}_{\text{worst}} - Z_w K_e y + Z_w K_e \hat{y} \\ & = (A - Z_w K_e C_2)z - (A - Z_w K_e C_2)\hat{z} + B_1 w_{\text{worst}} \\ & \quad - Z_w K_e D_{21} w_{\text{worst}} - B_1 \hat{w}_{\text{worst}} + Z_w K_e D_{21} \hat{w}_{\text{worst}} \end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{z} := e + z$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e} & = (A - Z_w K_e C_2)z - (A - Z_w K_e C_2)(e + z) + B_1 \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w z \\ & \quad - Z_w K_e D_{21} \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w z - B_1 \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w \hat{z} + Z_w K_e D_{21} \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w \hat{z} \\ & = -(A - \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-1} D_{21} B_1^T X_w))e \end{aligned}$$

Lyapunov's function candidate and derivative is chosen by

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^T \sigma + \frac{1}{2} e^T e$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} & = \sigma^T \dot{\sigma} + e^T \dot{e} = \sigma^T \left(G_{SS}^T \hat{z} \right) \\ & \quad - e^T \left(A - \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-1} D_{21} B_1^T X_w) \right) e \\ & = \sigma^T G_{SS}^T \left(A\hat{z} + B_2 \left(-K_{W-SMC}^{equal} \hat{z} \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z})) \right) \right) + B_1 \hat{w}_{\text{worst}} \\ & \quad + Z_w K_e C_2 z + Z_w K_e D_{21} w_{\text{worst}} + Z_w K_e D_{22} \left(-K_{W-SMC}^{equal} \hat{z} \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z})) \right) \\ & \quad - Z_w K_e C_2 \hat{z} - Z_w K_e D_{21} \hat{w}_{\text{worst}} - Z_w K_e D_{22} \left(-K_{W-SMC}^{equal} \hat{z} \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z})) \right) \\ & \quad - e^T \left(A - \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-1} D_{21} B_1^T X_w) \right) e \end{aligned}$$

Let $w_{\text{worst}} = \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w z(t)$, and $\hat{w}_{\text{worst}} = \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w \hat{z}(t)$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} & = \sigma^T G_{SS}^T \left(A\hat{z} + B_2 \left(-K_{W-SMC}^{equal} \hat{z} \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z})) \right) \right) + B_1 \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w \hat{z} \\ & \quad + Z_w K_e C_2 z + Z_w K_e D_{21} \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w z \\ & \quad - Z_w K_e C_2 \hat{z} - Z_w K_e D_{21} \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w \hat{z} \\ & \quad - e^T \left(A - \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-1} D_{21} B_1^T X_w) \right) e \\ & = \sigma^T G_{SS}^T \left[A - B_2 K_{W-SMC}^{equal} \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z})) \right] + B_1 \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w \hat{z} \\ & \quad + \sigma^T G_{SS}^T \left(Z_w K_e (C_2 + D_{21} \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w) \right) e \\ & \quad - e^T \left(A - \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-1} D_{21} B_1^T X_w) \right) e \end{aligned}$$

Let $K_{W-SMC}^{equal} := (G_{SS}^T B_2)^{-1} \left[G_{SS}^T (A + B_1 \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w) \right]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} & = \sigma^T G_{SS}^T \left[A - B_2 \left(G_{SS}^T B_2 \right)^{-1} \left[G_{SS}^T (A + B_1 \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w) \right] \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z})) \right] \\ & \quad + B_1 \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w \hat{z} + \sigma^T G_{SS}^T \left(Z_w K_e (C_2 + D_{21} \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w) \right) e \\ & \quad - e^T \left(A - \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-1} D_{21} B_1^T X_w) \right) e \\ & = \sigma^T G_{SS}^T A \left[1 - \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z})) \right] \hat{z} \\ & \quad + \sigma^T G_{SS}^T B_1 \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w \left(1 - \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z})) \right) \hat{z} \\ & \quad + \sigma^T G_{SS}^T \left(Z_w K_e (C_2 + D_{21} \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w) \right) e \\ & \quad - e^T \left(A - \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w - Z_w K_e (C_2 - \gamma^{-1} D_{21} B_1^T X_w) \right) e \end{aligned}$$

The estimation error is $e \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\dot{V} = \sigma^T G_{SS}^T A \left[1 - \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z})) \right] \hat{z}$$

$$+ G_{SS}^T B_1 \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w \left(1 - \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{z})) \right) \hat{z} \leq 0$$

subject to,

$$\text{if } \sigma > 0, \quad \dot{V} = 0$$

$$\text{if } \sigma = 0, \quad \dot{V} = 0$$

$$\text{if } \sigma < 0, \quad \dot{V} \leq -2kG_{SS}^T A\hat{z} - 2kG_{SS}^T B_1 \gamma^{-1} B_1^T X_w \hat{z} < 0$$

k is positive constant.

The above condition is satisfied on negative definite, and is *asymptotically stable*. This completes the proof of this theorem. \square

3. Conclusion

A separation theorem and a stability proof of a nonlinear feedback linearization- H_w /sliding mode controller (NFL-ROO/SMC) have been done.

References

- [1] J. C. Doyle, K. Glover, P. P. Khargonekar and B. A. Francis, "State-space solutions to standard H_2 and H_∞ control problems", IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control, Vol. 34, No. 8, pp. 831-847, Aug., 1989.
- [2] V. I. Utkin, "Variable structure systems with sliding modes", IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control, AC-22, No. 2, pp. 212-222, April, 1977.
- [3] W. C. Chan and Y. Y. Hsu, "An optimal variable structure stabilizer for power system stabilization", IEEE Trans. on Power Apparatus and Systems, Vol. PAS-102, pp. 1738-1746, Jun., 1983.
- [4] J. J. Lee, "Optimal multidimensional variable structure controller for multi-interconnected power system", KIEE Trans., Vol. 38, No. 9, pp. 671-683, Sep., 1989.
- [5] M. L. Kothari, J. Nanda and K. Bhattacharya, "Design of variable structure power system stabilizers with desired eigenvalues in the sliding mode", IEE Proc. C, Vol. 140, No. 4, pp. 263-268, 1993.
- [6] S. S. Lee, J. K. Park and J. J. Lee, "Sliding mode-MFAC power system stabilizer", Jour. of KIEE, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-7, Mar., 1992.
- [7] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Sliding mode-model following power system stabilizer including closed-loop feedback", Jour. of KIEE, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 132-138, Sep., 1996.
- [8] S. S. Lee, J. K. Park et al., "Multimachine stabilizer using sliding mode-model following including closed-loop feedback", Jour. of KIEE, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 191-197, Dec., 1996.
- [9] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Sliding mode power system stabilizer based on LQR - Part I", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 32-38, 1996.
- [10] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Sliding mode observer power system stabilizer based on linear full-order observer - Part II", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 39-45, 1996.
- [11] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Full-order observer-based sliding mode power system stabilizer with desired eigenvalue-assignment for unmeasurable state variables", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 36-42, 1997.
- [12] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "New sliding mode observer-model following power system stabilizer including CLF for unmeasurable state variables", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 88-94, 1997.
- [13] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Multimachine stabilizer using sliding mode observer-model following including CLF for unmeasurable state variables", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 53-58, 1997.
- [14] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, " H_∞ observer-based sliding mode power system stabilizer for unmeasurable state variables", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 70-76, 1997.
- [15] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Nonlinear feedback linearization-full order observer/sliding mode controller design for improving transient stability in a power system", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 184-192, 1998.
- [16] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Nonlinear feedback linearization- H_w /sliding mode controller design for improving transient stability in a power system", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 193-201, 1998.
- [17] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Design of power system stabilizer using observer/sliding mode, observer/sliding mode-model following and H_w /sliding mode controllers for small-signal stability study", Inter. Jour. of Electrical Power & Energy Systems, accepted, 1998.
- [18] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Design of reduced-order observer-based variable structure power system stabilizer for unmeasurable state variables, IEE PROC.-GEN., TRANS. AND DISTRIB., accepted, 1998.
- [19] R. Marino and P. Tomei, "Nonlinear control design", Prentice-Hall Press, 1995.